



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS, L (1891).

I, pp. 1-12. E. Rohde reiterates his views (Philol. 49, p. 230) on the date of the composition of Plato's Theaitetos. The article is devoted to the discussion and refutation of Zeller's view (Archiv f. Gesch. d. Philos. 4, 189-214) that the proper date is about 391 B. C.

II, pp. 13-30. R. Opitz attempts to re-arrange the 'Weiberspiegel' of Semonides of Amorgos (lines 1-96) in such fashion as to carry through consistently the principle of contrasted pairs. He opposes the sow to the mare, the fox to the ass, the bitch to the cat (weasel) and the ape to the bee. The simile of the sea illustrates further the disposition of the fox, and the mole, that of the ass. The ancient editors are responsible for the MS text.

P. 30. Crusius solves the obscure proverb Λεωκόριον οἰκεῖς by showing it to be merely a *lemma* in some old lexicon which was turned into a phrase by the addition of a verb.

III, pp. 31-42. Schmid's view (Philol. 49, 21) that Kratippos was the editor of Thukydides calls forth a denial from Stahl. "It is impossible that Kratippos could have been a contemporary of Thukydides."

P. 42. C. Wagener. Note on *nequa*.

IV, pp. 43-8. K. Tümpel. Analysis and criticism of Diodorus, V 55.

P. 48. C. Wagener. On Cyprian, p. 292, 2 (H).

V, pp. 49-57. K. Prächter, after a critical survey of the fragments of Metopos, Theages and Archytas (Stob., Fl., 1, 64-7), finds a relation between them and the Peripatetic teachings of Arius Didymus.

P. 57. H. Köstlin emends Iustin. 61, 2, 1.

VI, pp. 58-64. S. E. Anspach emends some passages in Cicero's Republic.

Pp. 64, 336-53, 498, 544, 565, 730 and 742. M. Petschenig emends various passages in Ammianus Marcellinus.

VII, pp. 65-73. O. Günther. Zur Textkritik des Ammianus Marcellinus.

VIII, pp. 74-80. Th. Stangl. Zu Lucifer Calaritanus. Textual criticism.

IX, pp. 81-5. E. Ströbel. Zu Cicero's Tuskulanen (continued from Philol. 49, 49). MS readings.

X, pp. 86-92. G. Busolt thinks that the Καλλίας εἶπε of the important Psephisma of 435-4 (CIA. I, 32, A) refers to the Καλλίας ὁ Καλλιάρχου of Plato,

Alkib. I, 119, and that he was the son of Kalliades who was strategos in 432-1 and fell at Potidaia (Thuk. I, 61).

P. 92. M. Petschenig emends Ian. Nepotianus.

XI, pp. 93-107. O. Crusius, *Die Epiphanie der Sirene, à propos of* Schreiber's Reliefbilder, T. LXI (reproduced here at p. 104), which Michaelis terms "Das räthselhafte Symplegma eines Silen und einer Sirene," writes a very interesting article on the place and attributes of the Sirens in Greek popular tradition. He shows that the Siren in folk-belief was a *succuba*, and as such is to be reckoned under the rubric of vampirism, a belief which has more extensive ramifications than any one has yet suspected. As a vampire the Siren might follow men to their graves and prey upon them there. Hence it becomes clear that the figure of a Siren, which is so often found carved on tombs, was put there as an *apotropaion*. Moreover, the male figure in the relief which Crusius has reproduced has not the most remote resemblance to a Silenus: it is merely a weary man taking his siesta at the midday hour of Catullus and Ovid.

XII, pp. 108-36. A. Mommsen investigates the usage of the word *σκίρα*, which, whatever its meaning, was the name of something carried in the festal processions of both Athena and Demeter. He rejects the theory of Lysimachides that it has to do with *σκιάδιον*, and by a long and interesting series of proofs shows the plausibility of another old theory connecting the word with *σκίρος* (gypsum). Especial reference is made to Schol. on Lucian, *Hetair. Dial.* 2, 1 (*Rhein. Mus.* 25, 549, Rohde).

XIII, pp. 137-62. Th. Zielinski examines the legend of Erysichthon as told by Ovid (*M.* 8, 728 ff.). The introduction of Fames is, of course, Roman. The Mestra episode is not a late invention, but it has no organic connection with the rest of the story. Z. quotes a number of parallel folk-tales, most of them of Slavonian origin. Erysichthon = Poseidon, and the legend of his hunger, Z. thinks, pictures the continual encroachment of the sea upon the land.

XIV, pp. 163-72. O. Crusius examines the fragment of a song (with musical notation) found on the base of a statue (*Bull. de corr. Hell.* VII).

Pp. 173-84. Miscellen.—O. Crusius supports the *'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία* as a genuine work of Aristotle.—K. Neumann. *Zur Lehre vom Zusammenhange des kaspischen und erythraeischen Meeres.*—A. Wiedemann connects the story which Herodotos (II, 91) tells of Perseus with the Egyptian district of Pers (*Recueil de mon. égypt.* 4, 72-6).—M. Kiderlin emends *Quint.* 7, 3, 34; M. Petschenig, several passages of Seneca, and A. E. Schöne, Tacitus, *H.* 2, 62, 1.

XV, pp. 185-90. P. Hartwig discusses two vase-paintings of the fifth century B. C. representing the contest of Herakles and Geras. Realism is evident. The story has no known root in early tradition, and the author agrees with Dümmler that the subject was one suggested by the comedy.

XVI, pp. 191-229. G. F. Unger. Eudoxos of Knidos and Eudoxos of Rhodes. Unger places the birth of Eud. of Knidos at about 422-1 instead

of 408-7 (Boeckh), and the publication of the *Oктаeteris*, the first work which would make applicable to him the term *ἐγνωρίζετο*, at 391-90. In the second part of his article Unger undertakes to show that the *Γῆς Περίοδος* was not, as Boeckh contended, the work of Eud. of Kn., but of Eud. of Rhodes, and was written not earlier than 261 B. C. The work consisted of nine books. In conclusion Unger attempts to give some idea of their contents.

Pp. 229 and 400. C. Radinger emends Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολιτεία*, p. 15, 10 and 20, 2.

XVII, pp. 230-47. L. Bornemann. Notes critical and exegetical on Pindar's eighth Pythian. B. follows the scholiast in fixing the date at Ol. 83, 3, which would make it the latest ode of Pindar. This adds the eighth to the list of supposed dates for this poem, beginning with Hermann, who placed it at Ol. 75, 3.

XVIII, pp. 248-61. B. Todt emends or discusses various passages in the Seven against Thebes (274-355). He thinks that the author has here given expression to his sympathy with Mykenai, which was overrun and destroyed by the Argives the year before the play was brought out.

XIX, pp. 262-87. P. Natorp supports well, against Gomperz, his thesis that the *Περὶ Τέχνης* (Pseudo-Hippokrates) is not the work of either Protagoras or his 'Doppelgänger.' The treatise shows traces of sophistic, but it is not the composition of a sophist. The *Περὶ Τέχνης* is a defence of the art of healing, evidently written by a physician. Protagoras was not a physician, and, moreover, in common with all sophists, would be attacking, not defending, the healing art.

XX, pp. 288-96. F. Dümmler. Zum Herakles des Antisthenes. Opposes Kaibel's views (*Hermes*, 25, 581 ff.).

XXI, pp. 297-319. W. Schmid. Bemerk. über Lukians Leben und Schriften. Discusses the genuineness of certain disputed works and attempts to establish some definite dates in the life of the author.

Pp. 319 and 335. Grau emends Terence, *Adel.* 1, 1, 15-16 and *And.* 5, 2, 21.

XXII, pp. 320-35 and XLVII, pp. 731-42. H. Köstlin. Critical and exegetical notes on Valerius Flaccus. Con. from *Philol.* 48, 647.

XXIV, pp. 354-72. Manitius. Beiträge zur Gesch. der röm. Dichter im Mittelalter (con. from *Philol.* 49, 554 ff.). Devoted entirely to Juvenal.

Pp. 373-84. Miscellen.—Crusius. Note on *onoskelia*, *ὄνος ἕεται* and *oknos*.—R. von Scala. On a proverb in Polybius, *Frag.* 121.—H. Fischer. On the hexameter at the beginning of the Epistle of James, 1, 17. He thinks that this proverbial monostich is a reminiscence, not a citation, and in its original setting corresponded to our English expression "Never look a gift horse in the mouth."—H. Fischer explains the much-disputed method of dressing the hair among the Suebi (*Tac.*, *Germ.* 38) by reference to the Column of Trajan (*Fröhner*, pl. 52).—P. Hagen. Zu Antisthenes.

XXV, pp. 385-92. G. Wentzel. Ποσειδῶνος γοναί. W. opposes Immerwahr's view (Bonner Studien, p. 191) of the legend told by Pausanias, 8, 8, 2. The story is the result of contamination. There is no original Illyrian legend at the bottom of it, but a legend of Poseidon, of which the development can only be due to some cult of Poseidon. The original notice upon which Pausanias is based has passed through many hands and suffered accordingly, but neither Verrius Flaccus (P. Diac. 101, M.) nor the Vergilian scholium (G. 1, 12) can throw any light on the subject.

XXVI, pp. 393-400. G. Busolt. Zur Gesetzgebung Drakons. Aristotle's exposition of the Draconian Code may be accurate, but it can hardly be said to have rested on an immediate examination of the code itself, as Kaibel seems inclined to believe. Aristotle's account impresses one as the result of varied historical reading.

XXVII, pp. 401-29. A. Bauer. Ansichten des Thukydides über Kriegsführung. Bestows the highest praise upon the thorough knowledge and far-sighted sagacity of Thukydides as a soldier and commander, and draws some interesting parallels from the conduct and outcome of the war of 1870. He shows that those much-needed reforms in the Athenian military policy, the necessity of light-armed troops to reinforce the old-fashioned heavy infantry, as demonstrated in Aetolia (Thuk. 3, 112); the advisability of cavalry, as shown in the Sicilian expedition; the futility of not giving a general full discretionary powers, especially in the conduct of a distant war, as shown in the lamentable experience of Nikias and Demosthenes—reforms which, when they were at last put consistently into practice, made the fortune of Philip and Alexander—were all pointed out by Thukydides, and in such a way as to show that he recognized the impossibility of Athenian success without them. In conclusion Bauer administers a timely and deserved rebuke to those philologists who approach Thukydides entirely upon the rhetorical side and assume at all times the liberty of correcting the text into something which *they* can understand. It is possible that Thukydides knew as much about Greek as do several of his critics in modern times, and it seems evident that he knew more about military tactics.

XXVIII, pp. 430-5. G. Hirschfeld discusses several inscriptions, found near Miletus and Halicarnassus, consisting of νίκη followed by some proper name in the genitive. It is apparent that they all belong to Christian times. H. draws attention to the fact that in the N. T., especially in the writings of John, whose influence was very strong in Asia Minor, the words νίκη and νικάν have a special meaning of "remaining steadfast in the faith." In some cases the workmanship would suggest that the inscription had been secretly cut by friends of the deceased, and H. is inclined to think that νίκη here is used in its special Christian sense, and as such was a sort of password among the faithful, the real meaning of which was unintelligible to the outside world.

XXIX, pp. 436-46. Holzinger. Aristotle's Politeia and the Excerpta of Heraklides. H. thinks that the author of these Excerpta was Heraklides of Pontus. He did not, as Rose believes, draw largely from Didymus.

P. 446. O. Crusius. Note on the scazon in the light of the Herondas Papyrus.

XXX, pp. 447-57. W. Soltau. Zur röm. Chronologie. Astronomical basis for Roman chronology and discussion of the nundinal letters between 445 and 190 B. C.

XXXI, pp. 458-68. R. Heinze thinks that Lucian's Anacharsis follows a tradition which gave the conversation of Solon and Anacharsis on the Greek athletic training, and in the end justified Anacharsis in his disapproval of it. It is pointed out that the earlier work, whatever it was, had its origin among the Cynics, whose opposition to every phase of purely national culture as such was characteristic of a school which preached cosmopolitanism and a return to nature.

P. 468. C. Radinger emends three passages in Herodotos in the light of Aristotle's Politeia.

XXXII, pp. 469-98. M. Faber. On the Greek Pentathlon.

XXXIII, pp. 499-506. W. Nestle. Ueber griechische Göttermasken. The habitual use of masks in the Dionysos worship is, of course, well known. But the author goes on to show (beginning with Hyperides, Eux. 35 f.) that it must have been the custom of the Greeks at certain intervals to drape in rich garments, and also to furnish with an appropriate mask, the rough image in which the divinity was worshipped. This gives special force to Pindar's simile (Isth. 2, 8), a new point of view for the use of masks in the theatre, and suggests an explanation of the numerous representations of masks which are being unearthed from time to time. The author will find many instructive and interesting parallels in analogous practices still current among the North American Indians and Pacific Islanders of to-day.

P. 506. Häberlin emends Juvenal, 11, 56. *Draucus* for *raucus*.

XXXIV, pp. 507-28. B. Todt. Emendations to Aeschylus, Seven against Thebes. The author's death occurred while this, his last piece of work, was still in the press. "Unsre Wissenschaft," says the editor in a closing note, "verliert an ihm einen rüstigen Arbeiter und Vorkämpfer der auch für ihre alten Rechte in der Schule und im Leben mit ganzer Persönlichkeit einzutreten gewohnt war."

XXXV, pp. 529-44. Fr. Cauer. Studien zu Theognis. Continued from Philol. 49, 662.

XXXVI, pp. 545-9. L. Holzapfel emends passages in Plutarch's Lives. To be continued.

XXXVII, pp. 550-65. Th. Wiedemann opposes Landgraf's theory that the author of the Bellum Africanum was Asinius Pollio. W. thinks that the author, who was very likely a centurion, was a member of the fifth legion, to which Pollio did not belong. Moreover, the point of view with regard to Caesar is not such as we can ascribe to Pollio. It is evident,

too, that the author took part in the whole campaign, whereas it is hardly possible that Pollio did so. The argument of syntax and style is one which must never be pushed too far, and it is especially dangerous here, where the amount of unimpeachable testimony is almost nothing.

Pp. 566-76. Miscellen.—In connection with Homer, Il. I 128 ff., K. Tümpel calls attention to a gloss of Hesychius (s. v. Πυλαυιδεες) hitherto overlooked.—J. Baunack. Zu den Weihgeschenklisten aus dem Kabirion.—R. Meister. Translation of the votive inscription from the Cretan Asklepieion.—E. Klussmann. Critical notes on Boetius, De Consol. Philos.

XXXVIII, pp. 577-82. Th. Baunack. On the fragment of a Cretan sepulchral inscription.

P. 582. R. Peppmüller adds a note to Zacher's article (Philol. 48, 313).

XXXIX, pp. 583-606. G. Busolt. On the Psephisma, CIA. IV, 2, No. 35, C.

P. 606. Graf emends Lucian, Fisherman, c. 45.

XL, pp. 607-36. In the first part of this article, Omphale—Hebe—Thrassa, K. Tümpel undertakes to show that Herakles and Omphale is simply another version of Helios and Hera. The peculiar relations of Herakles and her who is no longer to be called a Lydian queen find their origin in the 'Mutterrecht' which in early times prevailed in the Greek islands and elsewhere. The second part of the article, Die Enchelys von Kos im Poseidon-Polybates-Kampf, is an excursus on Pausan. 1, 2, 4.

P. 636. F. Polle thinks that βάραθρον is a proper name.

XLI, pp. 637-50. B. Heisterbergh. On the *ius Italicum*. In 1852 Th. Mommsen (Röm. Feldmesser, p. 191) said: "After Philippi, Cisalpine Gaul acquired the *ius Italicum*, i. e. exemption from taxes and conscription. Dion Cassius (48, 12) names it in so many words: τὸν τῆς Ἰταλίας νόμον." This statement and the quotation which supports it have been reiterated for over forty years by the various scholars who have dealt with the question. Now H. looks into his Dion Cassius and finds that the passage is not and never has been τὸν τῆς Ἰταλίας νόμον, but τὸν τῆς Ἰταλίας νομόν. This knocks a prop from under much that has been written about the *ius Italicum* and also tells a little story with a moral, of which the application is obvious. The term *ius Italicum*, as is shown in the Digest, is only a shortened expression for *ius coloniae Italicae*, and simply defines the political status of one class of colonies, the *coloniae Romanae*, as opposed to the other classes of colonies. Italy as a whole never possessed the *ius Italicum*. The *coloniae antiquitus Romanae* (Tac., A. 4) were termed *coloniae Italicae*, and their privileges defined by the term *ius Italicum*, because, after Gracchus' colony of Carthage and the colony of Narbo in Gaul were replaced by military colonies, it happened that *coloniae Romanae* were confined to Italy. It was their rights which, under the name of *ius Italicum*, were given to those transmarine cities which are known to have possessed it. The use of the so-called Marsyas statue upon certain coins

struck by such places was suggested by a similar statue in the Forum, and was meant to symbolize the city using it as a *colonia Romana*.

P. 650. F. Polle emends Phaedrus, 1, 3 and 3, 18.

XLII, pp. 651-8. R. Peppmüller. Critical notes on Homer and Hesiod.

P. 658. O. Crusius. Note on the Flinders-Petrie Papyri.

XLIII, pp. 659-88. H. Düntzer. Der Apologos der Odyssee. There is no reasonable ground for believing that the Apologos of the Odyssey originally contained fewer adventures than are now related in it. The poem is an organic whole, the work of a great poet, founded on the current lays and traditions at his command.

XLIV, pp. 689-712. C. Häberlin. Quaestiones Theocriteae. Theoc. composed the *Fistula Coi* 276-5, then seems to have gone to Antigonus 275, from him to Sicily, 273-2, and from there probably to Egypt. The *Hiero* was written about 273-2 and the *Ptolemaei Encomion* in 271, i. e. after the *Hiero*.

XLV, pp. 713-21. O. Crusius. Proben aus den *Mimiamben* des Herondas.

XLVI, pp. 722-30. I. Moessler. Critical notes on Petronius.

XLVIII, pp. 743-9. S. Linde. Coniect. in Senecam Rhetorem.

XLIX, pp. 750-8. W. Büchner. Ueber die *Lykiarchen*.

Pp. 751-68. Miscellen.—F. Polle. Sprachliche Missgriffe alter Schriftsteller.—C. Radinger, referring to Anthol. Palat. 14, 148, thinks Julian was born in May, not Sept.—October, 331. K. Neumann, in the following note, agrees to May, but thinks it should be May, 332, on account of the statement of both Ammianus and Eutropius of the emperor's age at the time of his death.—Th. Zielinski. *Flamen Sacrorum Municipium* (?).—F. Rühl interprets the obscure and much-disputed "O admirabile Veneris idolum" (Anthol. Lat. I 2, p. xl, Riese) as the farewell to a boy who leaves his friend or lover to follow another.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. Vol. XLVII.

Pp. 1-42. C. Brockelmann's article on Greek loan-words in Armenian is a most welcome contribution toward the study of the influence of one literary language upon another just developing its own literary style. The article shows the same excellence noticed in Hübschmann's on Syriac and Arabic loan-words in Armenian (ZDMG. XLVI 226-68; A. J. P. XIII 515). Armenian literature from its beginning has largely been influenced and its language moulded by the Greek, the bulk of its early literature being simply translations from Greek authors. Due credit is given by Brockelmann to the labors of J. J. Schroeder, Fr. Müller and Paul de Lagarde. The main interest in a

discussion of loan-words does not centre in the question as to the origin of this or that word, but in the perception of the influence which the nation from which it was taken exercised upon the borrower. Such knowledge can only be gained by a discussion of an almost complete material. We must distinguish between (1) loan-words that have become part and parcel of the thesaurus of the borrowing language, (2) foreign words adopted and used only by some authors, and (3) vocables which the translator merely transliterated partly because of an incomplete knowledge of the foreign language, and partly because of an obvious lack in the vocabulary of the home language. Brockelmann discusses, before taking up these three groups, 11 words that are usually but wrongly considered borrowed from the Greek. These are *behez*—*βύσσος*, *burgn*—*πύργος*, *iul*, *eul*—*ἐλαιον*, *metak's*—*μέταξα*, *p'andirn*—*πανδοῦριον*, *aušindr*—*ἀψίνθιον*, *tatrak*—*τρυγών*, *mor*—*μορέα*, *ark'ay*—*ἄρχων*, *p'alerut'iun*—*φάλλος*, *ph'allos*, *p'ennay*—*φαινής*. Then follows a discussion—(1) Of the 109 real loan-words, in 11 sections, of which that referring to the church and to ecclesiastical terminology is by far the more numerous (37). (2) Of 151 foreign words used only by certain authors, most of whom are theologians, for stylistic purposes. These men were, without exception, following Greek models. Words mentioned in this section occur not only in translations, but also in original Armenian compositions. (3) Words which occur only in translations from the Greek, simply transliterated by the translator for reasons mentioned above. This last case is very much analogous to that of the Greek translators of the Hebrew Old Testament writings. In this section 71 words belong to several translators and 50 others are found only once in extant Armenian literature, so far as this is accessible. Twenty-two words borrowed from Latin sources complete the whole list. A careful discussion of the Armenian equivalents of the Greek sounds concludes this most interesting contribution.

Pp. 43–85, 163–201. Ignaz Goldziher concludes the critical edition of the Divan of Garval b. Aus Al-Huṭey'a, begun in ZDMG. XLVI 1–53, 173–225. He prints the text of poems 34–94.

Pp. 86–91. Richard Pischel calls attention to von Oldenburg's proof that the story of *αἰξ τὴν μάχαιραν* occurs in the *Jātakan* 481. It is, therefore, of Sanskrit origin, not originally Greek, as Fränkel, in ZDMG. XLVI 737, maintained, explaining it as a Corinthian local legend.

Pp. 92–5. G. Bühler corrects some erroneous statements by K. Simon in the latter's edition of *Amaruṭataka*, Kiel, 1893, p. 24 fol., with regard to the *Rasikasamjivini* of King Arjunavarman.

Pp. 96–105. Theodor Nöldeke sends valuable remarks toward the study of the Aramean inscriptions of Sendschirli (سندشیرلو) in Syria. The excavations have just begun, but the results are of such importance that it is highly desirable to continue the work speedily and with all energy.

Pp. 106–17. M. J. de Goeje speaks of the Imâm aṣ-Ṣafī'i, correcting some old blunders and errors in the current biographies of the learned Muhammedan.

Pp. 120-9. A. Weber writes on the edition of the *Kâvyamâlâ*, giving a complete summary of this monthly magazine, edited since 1886 by Durgâprasâda in Yeypur (†1892) and Kâcinâtha in Bombay. The magazine was devoted chiefly to poetico-rhetorical literature. The arrangement in the pagination and make-up of the several parts is on the same plan as that of Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, only infinitely more complicated, inasmuch as one single part often contained continuations of seven or eight works begun in previous numbers. Compared with this, classical students have reason to congratulate themselves upon the simple arrangement in Bursian's *Jahresberichte*.

Pp. 130-42. Alexander von Kégl discusses the Persian literature of the nineteenth century with specimens from Ka'ânî and other Persian poets of our century.

Pp. 143-56. R. G. Bhandakar answers some points in the remarks of Professor Jolly on the History of Child-marriage. He maintains that *Medhâtithi* is by no means such an enemy of late marriages as Jolly would make us believe; he then discusses the time of the *garbhâdhâna* ceremony, and finally notices the age of marriage indicated in the *Gṛihya sūtras*. Jolly has generalized the statement in some of the *sūtras* and made them applicable to all, just as he has generalized that about the performance of the *garbhâdhâna* at the first *ṛitu*. "In the time of Āśvalāyana and many other authors of *Gṛihya sūtras*, marriages after puberty were a matter of course, the evidence being the nature of the ceremonies prescribed and their silence about the age of the bride. In the time of Hiranyakeśin child-marriages were coming into practice, and therefore he tells his followers that they are absurd, since the ceremonies require the bride to be in a condition of maturity. When Gobhila and the author of the *Mānavagṛihya* flourished, late marriages were falling into disrepute, though they were in practice, and hence they lay down marriage before puberty as the best course. When the *Smṛitis* of Manu and Baudhāyana were written, child-marriages were in full vogue, but late marriages were not rare. And in the time of the authors of the later *Smṛitis* the custom of late marriages became entirely obsolete, as it is at the present day. Still, however, it was not the custom, when the latter flourished, to begin intercourse necessarily on the first appearance of signs of puberty, as it is not now. It was entirely optional, some people following the practice, others not." On pp. 610-15 Jolly states that the differences of opinion between Bhandakar and himself are not essential, as seems at first, but concern only matters of subordinate importance.

Pp. 157-9, 516-19. Nestle and König explain their position regarding the spelling of the name of the old Syriac translation of the Bible.

Pp. 160-2. Walter Neisser replies to P. von Bratke's objections (ZDMG. XLV 682) against his statement that *ōman*, *ōmanvant*, *ōmyāvant* and *avant* are pre-Vedic forms preserved in the present text of the Veda.

Pp. 202-12. Paul Horn continues his studies in Persian literature with a discussion on the few fragments of Jewish-Persian poetry found in MS Or. 2453 of the British Museum, containing, e. g., Gāmi's poem on Jūsuf and Zuleichā, and a Jewish-Persian paraphrase of Ruth and the books of Samuel. Of the latter he publishes the poetic version of 1 Sam. xxv 1-12 (incl.).

Pp. 213-76. G. Rudloff and Dr. Ad. Hochheim edit a translation, with critical notes, of the Astronomy of Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Omar al-Gagmīnī, died 618 of the Hegira. An additional note by H. Suter is found on pp. 718-19.

Pp. 276-307. The common views of the Syriac intonation and metric system are not in harmony with modern science. This is the reason why it is almost impossible to edit Syriac poetry critically. Bickell's work, though meritorious, is nevertheless one-sided. A strictly scientific discussion of the principles is all the more needed, because Byzantine and late Latin poetry is largely based on Semitic, i. e. Syriac, metric system, as W. Meyer has shown in his article 'Anfang und Ursprung der lateinischen und griechischen rhythmischen Dichtung' (Abhdl. der bayr. Akad. d. W., philos.-philol. Kl., 1886, p. 372 foll.). That Meyer was correct in his statements, Hubert Grimme sets out to prove. Regarding intonation he comes to the following conclusions: (1) In earlier time, prior to the origin of the literary productions now extant, the accent was on the last syllable of a word, as is the case with the Aramean of the New Testament, e. g. Γαββαθᾱ, Ἀββαδῶν, etc. (2) In the historic time of Syriac literature the accent is usually on the penult; on the last only in case it is followed immediately by a monosyllabic word which in its meaning is very closely connected with the preceding. The poets, finally, have extended this law of the toned penult to words which in prose literature were pronounced as monosyllables, the first being a toneless *shēvā*-syllable.

Pp. 308-15. Ernst Leumann sends a list of copies and extracts, in transliteration, of Jaina-literature, collected especially in the British Museum, Cambridge University, and the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of London.

Pp. 320-4. Rudolph E. Brünnow has words of high praise for C. Bezold's latest publications, viz. Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum, vol. II (London, 1891); The Tell-el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum, with autotype facsimiles (London, 1892); Oriental Diplomacy, being the transliterated text of the Cuneiform Despatches between the Kings of Egypt and Western Asia in the XVth century before Christ, discovered at Tell-el-Amarna, etc. (London, Luzac & Co., 1893). J. Barth favorably notices Rudolf Geyer's edition of the poems and fragments of Aus ibn Hajar (Wien, 1892).

Pp. 335-84. Moritz Steinschneider, in his contribution to Arabic bibliography, describes some seventy writings of the Arabians contained in Hebrew MSS.

Pp. 385-94. Franz Praetorius continues his treatment of the Cushite elements in the Ethiopic language, begun in vol. XLIII 317. He gives additional notes and corrections to his former article, based on the results of his more recent studies, and then discusses some fourteen Ethiopic words which were probably borrowed from the Cushite, e. g. Eth. *ṣā'adawa* > *s'd*, the causative of 'd, cf. Saho and Afar 'adō 'white color, paint,' Eth. *ṣ* for *s* owing to following guttural; the word became a quadriliteral on Ethiopic soil. *Derār* 'evening meal,' and in church-language 'evening before a festival,' cf. Somali *ḡarār* = day (as opposed to night), and the denominative *ḡarāro* = dine, i. e.

take *the* meal of the day; the vocative ending in *-ō* found only in a few Ethiopic nouns. The same writer has a note on relics of dual-ending in Eth.

'*edē* = hand, which Barth declares as equal to Arab. يَدٌ. Neither can be proved beyond doubt. *Xaq^{uē}* = hip, Praetorius considers a sure case of dual. In a note on *Adulis*, he believes the name a compound of '*ādē*' ('place, settlement') + *ōlā* or *ōlī* (of doubtful meaning).

Pp. 397-417. J. H. Mordtmann discusses several fragments of the South-Arabic inscriptions collected by Halévy, some of which seem to belong to one and the same stone.

Pp. 418-39. Engaged in a study on the early Arabic poets, Rudolf Geyer received, through the kind offices of Professor J. de Goeje, from the library of the University of Leiden, the only extant MS of the *Ḥamāsah* of al-Buḥturī. While reading it Geyer noticed a number of verses attributed by Buḥturī to An-Nābiḡah of Ḍubyān, Ṭarafah, Zuhair and Imru'ul-kais, not found in the published collection of the six Divans. While some of these may not rightly belong to the authors to whom they were attributed by Buḥturī, Geyer yet believes their publication of some interest to students of Arabic poetry. An index of poets quoted by Buḥturī and compiled by Geyer will, as the author believes, serve as an incentive to the study of this important book. On pp. 715-16 Nöldeke has some additional remarks and corrections.

Pp. 440-9. W. Geiger prints another instalment of Balūčī texts and translation. In a short introductory note he calls attention to the following points: (1) Balūčī has no *oratio obliqua*; (2) the transitive verb in the preterit is construed as a passive, e. g. instead of 'I have done this,' the Balūče says 'this was done by me'; (3) the so-called absolute use of the verbal noun and past participle in *-fō*, e. g. 'having taken away the child's clothes, she went along the bank of the river.' The two texts published by Geiger are written in the Southern or Mazārī dialect of Northern Balūčī, from which the Lējārī or Northern dialect is distinguished by the greater decay of terminations.

Pp. 450-65. R. von Sowa has new material toward a study of the Gipsy dialect of Germany, with specimens collected in Eastern Prussia (Klein-Rekeitschen), Westphalia (Sassmanshausen) and Bohemia; and another note on the Gipsy dialect is published by E. Windisch, pp. 464-5.

Pp. 466-71. G. Bühler shows that Açoka called the highest officers of provinces (governors) Lajuka or Rājūka (*√rajju* : measure), because the measuring (determining) of the land tax was one of their foremost duties, an analogous case being the 'collectors' of the British-India Government. In the Kalpasūtra, on the other hand, *rajjāsabhā* designates the office of the royal scribes (*lekḥaka*), because the lower officials of the government did duties as copyists and as public surveyors.

Pp. 472-87. Ulrich Wilcken has a rather severe review of Hugo Winckler's *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens* (Leipzig, Pfeiffer, 1892). He criticises especially Winckler's explanation of *šar kibrāt erbitti* and *šar kiššati*. Winckler answered this review in a separate pamphlet: *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Assyriologie in Deutschland*, and Wilcken replies to this on pp. 710-14.

Pp. 487-514. W. Bacher prints an exhaustive criticism of A. Kohut's edition of the *Aruch completum* (Wien, 1878-92), with numerous additions and corrections, comparing it rather unfavorably with Levy's *Wörterbuch*. Notwithstanding many defects, it will yet remain forever a monument of industry and wide reading, and occupy an important place among the helps for the study of Talmudic and Midrashic literature.

Pp. 515-37. In his notice of R. Payne-Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*, fasc. IX, Immanuel Löw, while acknowledging the great value of the dictionary, considers it as not up to date, and gives numerous additions and corrections.

Pp. 539-73. The late Professor Minayeff had collected in 1875, while sojourning in Kaṭhmaṇḍu, materials for a Sanskrit-Newāri dictionary. After his death the MS was given, in 1891, to August Conrady, who now publishes it with a critical introduction. On the Newāri language see A. J. P. XIII 373.

Pp. 574-82. Hermann Jacobi, in his article on the tone in classical Sanskrit and the Prakṛit languages, shows that the present accentuation in Sanskrit is at least 2000 years old and has been preserved especially in the languages derived from it.

Pp. 583-94. F. Bollensen sends a third instalment of critical notes on the *Rigveda*.

Pp. 595-614. O. Franke. India's relation to the West. International commerce existed in ancient time as well as to-day. The kings of Babylon and Nineveh corresponded with Egypt's monarchs about 1500 B. C.; and Franke makes quite probable that similar relations may have existed in India. The Pāli was in this case the mediator between East and West, most of the Sanskrit loan-words found in Greek showing a Pāli (or Prakṛit) form rather than a pure Sanskrit. Thus the Ἀσσακηνοί (of Arrian) are derived from Pāli *assa* (horse); Τάξιλα > Pāli *Takkasilā* rather than Skt. *Takṣaṣilā*. The same is the case with words like λάκκος (Periplous) > Pāli *lākha* (or **lakkhā*) rather than Skt. *lākṣā* or *rākṣā*; σάκχαρ, *saccharum*, Arab. *sukkar* > Pāli *sakkharā* rather than Skt. *ṣarkarā*; βήρυλλος, βήρυρρος > Pāli *veḷuriya*, not Skt. *vaiḍūrya*; camphor > Pāli **kamphūtra* (whence *kappūtra*) rather than Skt. *karpūtra*. Again, Pāli *Yona* or *Yonaka* shows that this section of the Indian nation must have dwelt nearer the Ἰωνες than the Sanskrit people which called them *Yavana*. These and many other instances prove that Pāli was spoken to the west of India. At the time of the Suttapiṭaka, the nation living on the seashore of Western India knew of early coasting voyages to western countries and had attained a considerable degree of nautical knowledge. Franke believes that some words in Semitic and Hamitic dialects which cannot easily be explained were brought there by Eastern navigators from India; on the other hand, he conjectures that Pāli *keṭubha* (Skt. *kaiṭabha*) was borrowed from the Semitic *kēthābhā*.

Pp. 615-21. J. Jolly publishes Stenzler's *Collectanea* toward a history of Indian law.

Pp. 622-5. H. Hübschmann shows that Šahrbarāz and Razmyōzān were simply two honorary titles given to Xōream (= Arab. Farruhān), the greatest general of King Chosrau.

Pp. 626-97. Samuel Kohn describes and critically discusses the Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch, edited by Petermann and Vollers (5 parts, 1872-91). The work will for many years remain the standard book for the study of Samaritan literature. On the basis of the large MS material contained in this publication, Kohn reiterates his statement, made first in 1875, viz. that the Polyglot edition of 1645, the MS upon which Petermann based his edition, and all the codices from which he quotes the variant readings represent just so many recensions of the same Samaritan Targum, each in its way showing peculiar text corruptions, corrections and unwarranted alterations, all being the products of a time when the Samaritan had long ceased to be a living language; and lastly, that the original Samaritan Targum has not yet been recovered and probably, with the exception of a few fragments, is no longer in existence.

Pp. 698-709. Oskar Mann recommends Paul Horn's *Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie* (Strassburg, K. Trübner, 1893) and J. G. Stickel notices favorably Heinrich Nützel's *Münzen der Rasuliden, nebst einem Abriss der Geschichte dieser jemenischen Dynastie* (Berlin, 1891).

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

HERMES, Vol. XXVIII (1893), Heft 3-4.

O. Gradenwitz, *Ein Protokoll von Memphis aus Hadrianischer Zeit*, comments on certain legal points in the record of an *actio tutelae* preserved in a Greek papyrus at Berlin (136).

E. Wendling, *Zu Posidonius und Varro*. The praise of the imitative capacity of the Romans found in a Greek Anecdoton, Herm. XXVII 121, is paralleled by Athen., Strabo, Diod. Sall.; their common source is Posidonius, who here, as often, develops an idea of Polybius. The Greeks borrowed from Posidonius directly, the Anecdoton through some rhetorical writer, and Sallust through Varro.

J. Vahlen, *Varia XXXIX*, reads (Sen. de brev. 15, 1) *non stabit quominus plurimum quantum <cum> coeperis haurias*; XL, defends *pleraque omnium* in Min. Felix Oct. 10, 1, and *plurimo omnium* in Nep. Epam. 1, 4; XLI, reads (Caes. B. G. VI 22) *ne accuratius <quam> ad frigora atque aestus vitandos*.

E. Norden, *Vergilstudien I. Die Nekyia*. This episode, though externally like Od. 11 with additions from other epics, is based upon a Pythagorean-Orphic Nekyia, contaminated in v. 724 ff. with Stoic teachings; this was written by a learned Alexandrian poet, as appears from vv. 442-51, which go back to an Alexandrian *κατάλογος* differing from the usual tradition. This explanation removes all the supposed inconsistencies in the Vergilian Nekyia. Vv. 743, 4 were intended to supplant 745-7, but Varius published both together.

Diels, *Ueber die Excerpte von Menons Iatrika in dem Londoner Papyrus 137*. This compilation from the time of Trajan cites many authorities at length, Plato, Philolaos, Hippo 'of Kroton,' and Herodikos of Selymbria among the number. The quotation from the *de flatibus*, a sophistic treatise of

the fifth century, as a genuine work of Hippocrates shows that as early as Menon's master, Aristotle, the Hippocratean corpus had suffered serious admixture of foreign matter.

L. Holzapfel, *Doppelte Relationen im VIII. Buche des Thukydides*. Ch. 29-44, 55 are based on a Peloponnesian, ch. 45-54, 56 on an Athenian account of the same period. The former, continued in ch. 57-63, is favorable to Astyochus, but a third source, traceable to discontented soldiers in his own army, charges him with venality (50, 3) and inaction (78, 1). The two chief sources differ in their account of the payment of the soldiers (ch. 29, 45), of Tissaphernes' policy (ch. 43, 52), and in other details. The behavior of Astyochus before Samos (ch. 63, 1 and 78-9) and the opposition of Alcibiades to an attack on the Piraeus (ch. 82 and 86) are each related twice, but presented in a different light.

Miscellen.—R. Pischel shows that Antig. 909-12 = Hdt. III 19 is paralleled by Rāmāyāṇa 6, 24; 7, 8 (Gorressio), and Jātaka 67 (I 306 Fausb.). Since Hdt. lays the scene in Persia, that country probably transmitted the legend from India to Greece.—F. Hiller v. Gaertringen emends Anth. IX 147 to *Ξενοκλῆς ὁ Ξεΐνιδος* and localizes it at Eleusis by comparing a new Eleusinian inscription in 'Εφημ. ἀρχαιολ. 1892, p. 101.—F. Dümmler in Athen. X 453 C reads τὸ δὲ προάγον ἐστὶ ψύλλας ἔχειν, where ἔχειν means both 'to have' and 'to catch.'—W. Dittenberger reads in the new Mantinea inscription (Bull. Corr. Hell. XVI 569), col. I, l. 21, II 4 κα(τ) τῶρρέντερον 'in the male line.'—E. Bethe gives a collation of the Aratea of Germanicus from KCPGDM.—A. Erman shows that *ὄνος ὑπὸ οἴνου κτλ.* (Herm. XXVIII 163) is a literal translation of an Egyptian idiom.

J. Beloch, *Zur Geschichte Siciliens*. Hieron II became king in 265, but was a tyrant as early as 268, and general still earlier. The period 275-268 includes the continuation of the Carthaginian war, the peace with Carthage, and the strife between the Syracusans and Mamertines. Timaeus is Polybius' source for this period. Theocr. XVI was written 263/2.

P. Stengel, *Buphonien*. The myths connected with this ceremony show that it commemorates the first introduction of a blood sacrifice.

E. Norden. II. *Zur Aeneis* Ausgabe des Varius. Aen. VI 51-76, 83-97, 826-35 were written after the book was read to Augustus, and not revised by the author. 51-76 were inspired by Varro's *Antiquitates*, 83-97 were intended to supplant 890-2, 826-35 were inserted by Varius from the marginal notes of Vergil. *Plena deo*, quoted from Vergil by Seneca (*suas.* 3, 4), is an earlier form of 78-9. IV 387 was written to take the place of 386.—III. *Zur Aen.* VI 621-2. These verses refer to Antony and continue the idea of Georg. III 37-9.

E. Bethe, *Zur Ueberlieferung der Homerischen Hymnen*, gives a collation of HELP with some variants from MπD. HE are derived from one copy of Δ, LP from another, and π from still another.

H. Swoboda, *Ueber den Process des Perikles*. Perikles was tried only once, viz. in the summer of 430. The form of procedure was not *ἐθῆνα*, for the election was in March and he did not become unpopular till May; but if

re-elected, the generals were exempt from *εἶθυνα*. *Ἐπιχειροτομία* was not yet in existence, and neither process needed a special decree. *Εἰσαγγελία*, however, existed in the fifth century under the same form as in the fourth, and the decree of Drakontides is its *προβούλευμα*, whose severity Hagnon's amendments were intended to lessen.—*Notes*. The trial of Aspasia was earlier than 432. The Thucydidean *θέρος* began early in March. Ch. 45 of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* shows that this treatise does not rest on a documentary basis.

Mommsen, *Zur Geschichte der Caesarischen Zeit*. I. There were eighteen provinces under Caesar; beside the ten of Sulla, Bithynia, Cyrene, Crete, Syria, Illyricum, Gallia comata, Africa nova, Achaia.—II. Cic. ad fam. XV 20 was written in the latter part of 708. The Sabinus therein mentioned was P. Ventidius, and the satire on him in the Vergilian *Catalecta* was written 710.—III. Critical and exegetical notes to the Bell. *Hisp.*, based on a new collation of ATUV.—IV. A list of the *consulares* in the year 710 (cf. Cic. ad fam. XII 2).

A. Nikitsky publishes a new Attic inscription from Delphi, dated about 100 B. C. and containing a list of *πυθαῖσται*. It furnishes the first clear documentary proof of the existence of a *γένος* *Ἐνπατριδῶν*, mentions a new *γένος*, the *Πυρρακίδαι*, and gives the names of many Athenians.

J. Beloch, *Zu Diodor*, reads XXII 10 ἡκον Ἐνναῖοι λέγοντες κτλ.; XI 86 Ἐγεσταίοις καὶ Ἀλικυαίοις (with Koehler) ἐνστάντος πολέμου <πρὸς Σελινουντίους>. Halikya is not Salemi, but lay west from Mazaras. Pausanias, V 25, 5, has confused Motye with the Agrigentine castle, Motyon (cf. Diod. XI 91, 451 B. C.), and this gives us a later fixed date for Kalamis.

BARKER NEWHALL.